

recent base closure round. Over the years, Tom worked closely with me and my office and grew to be a personal friend.

But I never saw 'working' with Tom as work. Each meeting, each conversation was more of an interaction with an old friend than official business. His personal generosity integrated itself into the way he approached his job and how he lives his life.

Today, I honor his career and his service to the community. And I wish Tom improving health and Jeri and Tom many, many more years of happiness together.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the establishment of a Department of Peace and Nonviolence as a cabinet-level office of the executive branch of our government. I agree with Representative KUCINICH that war and the threat of war have dominated international relationships for much too long. As a participant in the Civil Rights Movement, as a human being who has faced the barrel of a loaded gun armed only with the philosophy of peace, it has been my belief for many years that war is obsolete as a tool of our foreign policy. But I realize that position may be too progressive for many of my colleagues to accept.

But maybe, just maybe at this moment in our nation's history, when we find ourselves struggling with the hopeless legacy of violence, maybe, just maybe we might be willing to consider the methods of peace as an intelligent, strategic alternative to war. At this very moment our sons and daughters are battling in the middle of an unnecessary war, a war we started, hoping that we could force democracy to grow.

But Mahatma Gandhi once said that violence begets violence. And a recipient of the Nobel Prize for Peace, Martin Luther King, Jr., once said if we as a people want peaceful ends, we must use peaceful means. When will the warring factions in Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and the United States be willing to say they have spilled enough innocent blood? When will they say it is time for us to lay down the tools and instruments of war? Today, can we hear the words of Gandhi, perhaps stronger now than ever before, "We must choose non-violence or non-existence"?

Are we finally willing to hear the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., "We must learn to live as brothers and sisters or perish as fools"? Can we, the most powerful nation in the world, use our influence, to raise these questions and give peace a chance?

Madam Speaker, as a nation and as a people we have researched, written about, studied, constructed, deployed and spent trillions of dollars on the best ways to destroy humanity. We have used the power of fear to dominate world affairs. What would happen if the most powerful nation on earth took the lead and through this Department of Peace decided to put even half of those resources toward developing ways to sustain humanity, ways to keep the peace in spite of competing inter-

national interests, and ways to gain influence using the power of diplomacy and negotiation?

Without constructive, alternative policies, without viable tools that leaders of nations and leaders of human kind can reach for, peace will always be a vanishing ideal that holds no substance. If we truly believe that peace is our ultimate goal, then we must use the resources of this great nation to that end. We must use the brilliance of American intelligence to develop the methods and mechanisms of peace, even more actively than we develop the mechanisms of war. That's why we need a Peace Academy that will create a diplomatic corps armed with the tools of peaceful influence.

We are all one people, Madam Speaker. We are one family, the human family, and we must find a way to understand each other, to make peace, and learn to live together.

THE GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH AND DATA MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2007

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Global Change Research and Data Management Act of 2007 with my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS. This bill updates the existing law that formally established the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) in 1990. This bill is also similar to the Global Change Research and Data Management Act that I introduced in the 107th and 108th Congresses.

Over the past decade, the USGCRP has significantly advanced our scientific knowledge of Earth's atmosphere and climate and has provided us with a wealth of new data and information about the functioning of our planet.

However, the program has not produced sufficient information, both in terms of content and format, to be the basis for sound decisions. The program has focused nearly all of its resources and efforts on scientific inquiry. Only one broad assessment of the impact of global change on society has ever been attempted by the program, and that assessment was completed nearly 7 years after its Congressionally mandated deadline. The local, state, regional, and national policymakers responsible for managing resources, fostering economic development, and responding to natural disasters need information to guide their decisions. In my view, it is critical that Congress reorient the USGCRP toward a user-driven research endeavor.

The recent release of the policy summary from the Fourth Assessment Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Working Group I, has helped solidify the growing scientific consensus that our climate is changing. This international effort had government support from around the world, including strong involvement from the U.S., and is a summary of the latest science about our climate. It reports that the Earth is warming—sea temperatures are rising, glaciers are melting, and air temperatures worldwide are increasing.

Most of the public and policy makers also agree that the climate is changing, but dis-

agreement remains about how much is the result of human activities. I think this bill deserves the support of people on both sides of that argument.

We need to move beyond debates about whether global change is occurring and allocating responsibility for the changes. I continue to believe fervently that we must do all we can to soften our impact on the environment and to slow the pace of global change. But we are going to have to deal with climate change with some mix of mitigation and adaptation. We must acknowledge the interdependence of our social, economic and environmental systems and learn to anticipate and adjust to changes that will inevitably occur.

In its 2003 review of the Administration's draft strategic plan for the USGCRP, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) acknowledged the need for research to evaluate strategies to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of global change, and the Academy recommended that the plan be revised to enhance efforts to support decision-making. The Global Change Research and Data Management Act of 2007 reorients the program to accomplish these goals.

The NAS praised the Administration for including the development of decision support tools in the strategic plan, but criticized the plan for its failure to "recognize the full diversity of decision makers" and for failing to "describe mechanisms for two-way communication with stakeholders."

The Global Change Research and Data Management Act would address these criticisms by requiring the Administration to identify and consult with members of the user community in developing the USGCRP research plan. The bill would also mandate the involvement of the National Governors Association in evaluating the program plan from the perspective of the user community. These steps would help to ensure that the information needs of the policy community will be met as generously as the funding needs of the academic community.

The 1990 law outlined a highly specific organizational structure for the USGCRP. Our bill would eliminate this detailed organizational structure and provide the President with the flexibility to assemble an Interagency Committee and organizational structure that will best deliver the products Congress is requesting. Our bill would, however, retain many of the key features of current law—the requirements for a ten-year strategic plan, for periodic assessments of the effects of global change on the natural, social, and economic systems upon which we depend, and for increased international cooperation in global change science.

Our bill would establish a new interagency working group to coordinate federal policies on data management and archiving. Advances in computer, monitoring, and satellite technologies have vastly expanded our ability to collect and analyze data. We must do a much better job of managing and archiving these important data resources to support the work of current and future scientists and policymakers.

I would like to thank Mr. INGLIS from South Carolina for cosponsoring of this bill. Crafting a new approach for the USGCRP is a non-partisan issue—increasing access to better and more relevant science is something that we all can agree will help us make better decisions.